THE CHARITY and LOYALTY Of ſome of our CLERGY.

IN

A ſhort View of Dr. *M*'s SERMON before their Majeſties at *Hampton-Court*, *July* the 14*th*, 1689. Wherein he ſtill charges the Proteſtant Diſſenters with Schiſm.

With ſome occaſional Remarks upon a Clergymans Conſiderations for taking the Oath of Allegiance to King WILLIAM and Queen MARY.

And upon the Hiſtory of Paſſive Obedience ſince the Reformation.

LONDON,

Printed for *Richard Janeway* in Queen's-head-Court in *Pater-noſter-Row*, MDCLXXXIX.

1/6

THE CHARITY and LOYALTY

Of some of our

CLERGY.

IN

A short View of Dr. Ms SERMON before their Majesties at *Hampton-Court*, *July* the 14th, 1689. Wherein he still charges the Protestant Dissenters with Schism.

With some occasional Remarks upon a Clergymans Considerations for taking the Oath of Allegiance to King WILLIAM and Queen MARY.

And upon the History of Passive Obedience since the Reformation.

LONDON,

Printed for *Richard Janeway* in Queen's-head-Court in *Pater-noster-Row*, MDCLXXXIX.

THE CHARITY and LOYALTY Of some of our CLERGY.

SIR,

YOU might well be backward in crediting the Account I gave you of Dr. *M*'s seeming pacific Sermon: Yet I hope now it is out in Print, you are abundantly satisfied, that though he would not be thought to *repine at the Indulgence now granted to the several Dissenters amongst us*; he cannot forbear the old charitable Appellation of *Schismaticks*: And I think there can be no greater Evidence of being in a Passion, of one sort or other, than the giving hard Words, or calling Names. To do this before the glorious *Repairers* of those *Breaches* which some among us would be continually making, you may well believe not to be very discreet: But there is a certain Bigottry which, I may say, fatally transports some Men.

Page 27.

When the chief Managers against the *Protestant Dissenters* seem'd weary or ashamed of those Arguments, which they by sad Experience found

found equally ſerviceable to the Papiſts: when the *Political Union* between Chriſt and Believers yielded to the *Spiritual*; and a fancy'd *Catholick-Communion*, in Rites and Ceremonies, to one upon the Terms of *common Chriſtianity*; It might ſeem ſtrange to have the old Cant revived by one of leſs Art, though ſmoother Addreſs: Were it not that the Errors of the Leaders of any Party ſtand for Maxims and Principles, till plainly retracted. And though the Mortification may be ſevere to Fleſh and Blood; yet whoever has ſerv'd the Papiſts or Arbitrary Power with his Doctrines, ought, if he be of Reputation with his Party, the rather to ſuffer an Eclipſe of his Fame by coming to the Stool of Repentance, leſt that very Fame help to ſpread the Contagion, and make his Errors Canonical. The Church indeed, whoſe Articles and Homilies they profeſs to receive, is far from authorizing their Conceits: but Men are apt to believe that they hear the Voice of the Church from the Pulpit; and that the *Prieſt's Lips preſerve* the true *Knowledg*; yet I think no Man need deſire greater Advantage for confuting their Eccleſiaſtical or Civil Politicks, than the laying hold of what themſelves own in cool Blood.

Compare a certain Treatiſe of Union and Communion with Chriſt Jeſus; and two Sermons of the ſame Perſons about Church Communion, with his Treatiſe of the Unity of the Church, and another of Proteſtant Principles.

Though the Doctor, on whom I now animadvert, has nothing of any Moment, but what we may eaſily trace him in from one of the Leaders: Yet in one reſpect he is himſelf an Original; being the firſt, who, to uſe his excellent Chime, has admoniſh'd Men, though the Law has given them *Liberty of Conſcience, to make Conſcience of their Liberty*: Or that charges the Proteſtant Diſſenters with *Schiſm*, notwithſtanding the *Legal Indulgence* or *Eaſe*.

Page 27.

Ibid.

Which

Which though I muſt own to be but an Opiate, which allays, but does not remove the Diſtemper; yet I cannot for my life underſtand how Non-compliance with Rites and Ceremonies inſtituted by humane Laws, ſhould be a Schiſm, when the ſame Law allows a Liberty: and would gladly know what is that Law of Chriſt which is *immutable and not to be repealed*, obliging Men to communicate in thoſe Rites and Ceremonies, which he never enjoyned; nor were enjoyned by any Law, but what ceaſes to be one to him, whom it allows in a Diſſent from thoſe who are in poſſeſſion of the Profits. *Page 28.*

If it be ſaid, That he charges Schiſm only upon ſuch as *Hypocritically and Maliciouſly make Breaches and Diſturbances in a Church, to revenge or advance themſelves by the ruin of it.* *Page 24.*

1*ſt*. It is evident, that if he do not inſinuate that all Diſſenters are thus Guilty, he therein departs from his Queſtion, which is of ſuch as upon *diſſatisfaction divide, and will not join with us.* *Page 16. & 23.*

2*ly*. Even theſe, as ſuch, are terrified with *what the Fathers have declared about this Matter*, that is, *dividing upon Diſſatisfaction*: Upon which, he ſays, *the Fathers, conſidering the ill effects and conſequences of Schiſm, have pronounced it as heinous a Sin as any whatſoever.* *Page 23.*

Wherefore the matter to which this Cenſure is apply'd, being *dividing upon Diſſatisfaction*; this, if he ſpeak conſiſtently, is *Schiſm* in the Language of the Fathers. Nor can any Inconſiſtencies or Contradictions be thought to qualify poſitive Aſſertions, till they are as poſitively renounc'd.

Nay, he ſays in another Place, that *though the Recuſants here are greater Schiſmaticks than any* other *Page 18.*

other Separatists among us: Yet neither can any of the other that separate, well clear themselves from being such. So that according to him, the Protestant Dissenters in general (not only such as *maliciously and hypocritically make Breaches*) *cannot well clear themselves from being Schismaticks.* And he advises such Dissenters *not to presume and encourage themselves in that Separation*, which he will have to be *causeless, because the Laws of the Land are so favourable to inflict no Penalties upon them for it. These*, says he, *do not undertake to justify the Thing, as if it were no Sin, only forbear to judg in it, and leave us wholly to the Law of Christ, which is immutable, and not to be repealed.*

So that he, it seems, is wiser than the Law, and does judg them guilty of this Sin of *Schism*, though the Law forbears to judg so. But there is more than this in the matter, and little less than a Reflection upon the *Parliament*, for making a Sin before God lawful to be committed: And if *Schism* be as heinous a Sin as any, and yet the *Parliament* makes this lawful; others will say, it might better make Murder so far lawful as to take off the Sanction by Penalties, which the Laws against it have. For admit all humane Penalties were taken away from Murder, it would be no less a Sin in the Eyes of all Men. Whereas in this case a Man incurs the danger of sinning in the Doctor's sense, without a sufficient Buoy: For, as all Religious Assemblies, with other Rites and Ceremonies than those which are used according to our Liturgy, were forbidden to Protestants only by Statute-Law upon certain Penalties; many cannot but think, that the Act which takes away those Penalties from Protestant

teſtant Aſſemblies, makes thoſe Aſſemblies lawful. And if it be a Sin for them ſtill to aſſemble together, though the Penalties are aboliſhd'd the amoving of them would but lead Men into Temptation: and the Statute become a *Legal Snare* in lieu of the *Illegal one.* Page 27.

I rememember the time when Clergy-Men thought it their Intereſt to maintain that the Sanction of a meer poſitive Law lies in the Penalty. Wherefore ſome would ask what now becomes of the Laws about Conformity, the Penalties being taken away? Though I muſt own the late Act to be penn'd with abundant Caution, to prevent the Cavils of a nice ſort of Men; yet it ſpeaks of *ſeparate Aſſemblies for Religious Worſhip permitted or allowed by it.* And gives ſuch encouragement to them, as to exempt their Preachers from certain ſecular Employments, the better to attend to the Work of their Miniſtry. And tho God Almighty may permit or ſuffer Sin, as he does not neceſſitate the avoiding it, yet he cannot be ſaid to allow it, (it being difficult to diſtinguiſh between allowing and approving) much leſs can he be thought to encourage it. Nor can that be thought a Sin, againſt which he has denounced no Judgment, eſpecially where he declares there ſhall be none. And if any thing became a Sin by humane Law, if that declare there ſhall be no Penalty, one would take it to be a virtual declaring, that it ceaſes to be a Sin; unleſs we can imagine that the Law which frees the Body, would enſnare the Mind. Nay, the Doctor ſeems to forget that he had called the late Act, *an Indulgence granted the Diſſenters,* in the Page immediately before Page 27.

Vid. Grand Queſtion concerning the Biſhops voting in Caſes Capital, Pag. 68. The Sanction of the Law is ceas'd which was irregularity, Pag. 69. If the irregularity be taken away, the Sanction is gone. And if the Sanction be taken off in a meer poſitive Law, the force of the Law is gone too. And therefore this Canon Law which forbids Clergy-Men being preſent in Capital-Caſes and giving Votes therein, is wholly taken away by the Reformation.

his Aſſertion, that the *Laws do not undertake to juſtify the Thing* he was then ſpeaking of, which was the *Liberty of Conſcience* which they give, *as if it were no Sin*: Which ſurely is a palpable Reflection that the Laws give indulgence to Sin.

But in charging this Sin of Schiſm, the Doctor here muſt needs go upon the Suppoſition that the Terms of Communion with the Church of *England* are enjoyned by *Chriſt*'s *immutable Law*: Upon which I dare ſay the Diſſenters will readily join Iſſue. Nor do they belive that Chriſt has made any Law for *England* but what he has made for all Mankind.

Yet the Doctor thinks he had proved them guilty from the Notion of Schiſm: it being, as he ſays, *the* Page 18. *ſtrict and proper Notion of Schiſm for Perſons cauſleſly to rend themſelves from the particular Church whereof* de jure *they are Members.*

If it be cauſleſly in the Judgment of the Party that divides, it were ſomething: But according to him, the Proteſtant Diſſenters who divide *upon Diſſatisfaction*, notwithſtanding ſuch real *Diſſatisfaction*, without any thing of *Malice* or *Hypocriſy*, are *Schiſmaticks*: For he will have their Diviſion to be *cauſleſs* in it ſelf. For ſuch to ſay they agree in *Doctrinals, it is only upon account of Ceremonies that they ſeparate, ſeemeth* (ſays he) *ſo far from excuſing the Thing, it really maketh it worſe.*

Vid. Dr. Bringhurſt's *Sermon before the* Ld. Mayor, May 26. 1689. *The ſpirituality of God's Worſhip under the Goſpel being a neceſſary qualification of it; ſome Men* may poſſibly ſcruple without any Malice or ill Deſign, *ſome Rites or Uſages in the Worſhip of God as being contrary to its Spirituality. Nothing but Order and Decency may be deſigned by them, or ſome external Ornaments for the Service of God, and by a fair and rational Interpretation, they may be ſo uſ'd without being impediments to the purity and ſpirituality of Divine Worſhip; yet ſeeing all Men cannot have the ſame Senſe of theſe things, and ſeeing what a Man ſcruples, he can never be edified by it, we are to conſider the infirmities of our Brethren, for* Order and Decency here is beſt, when they are in ſubſerveney to Edification.

But ſince Men are not apt to make due Allowances for humane Infirmities, till the Caſe comes to be their own; it may not be amiſs to put it ſo, as may affect ſome of our preſent Clergy. For them to rend themſelves from their People, and to intermit or wholly leave off their Miniſtry cauſleſly, muſt needs be as Schiſmatical, and as great a Breach of the Political Union, as for the People cauſleſly to ſeparate from them. But we ſay, and are ready to prove, that they who are ſuſpended, or may be depriv'd for refuſing to take the Oath of Allegiance to King *William* and Queen *Mary*, cauſleſsly rend themſelves from their People. If they ſay that they really ſcruple, Why ſhould cauſleſs Scruples excuſe them from Schiſm, and not the more ignorant Laity? If it is ſo far from excuſing the laſt, that it makes it worſe that they ſcruple not upon account of Doctrinals, the ſame will return upon them, whoſe Scruples are founded upon a ſuppoſed knowledg of humane Law, in which they are evidently miſtaken. And herein the Point turns the ſtronger upon them, that whereas the Law with great Equity gives Indulgence to Conſciences ſcrupulous about Religious Worſhip, and doubtful of the Power of humane Laws concerning it: the Law neither does nor can without Injury to the Publique give Indulgence to them, who, unleſs they give reaſonable Aſſurance of Fidelity, are to be look'd upon as of a contrary Allegiance; and ſo no Friends to the Power which protects them. And this is the rather to be believed, becauſe no Man who will take any promiſory Oath, can ſcruple ſwearing Allegiance now, but upon Suppoſition that the ſubject matter of his former Oath remains, and the late King ſtill continues his Leige

Lord, according to the Laws of the Engliſh Government. For Allegiance muſt follow the Law; it being nothing more than the Fidelity and Obedience which the Law requires. Were it more, we ſhould ſwear our ſelves Slaves, and the King Abſolute.

Though in relation to a future State, it may be too ſevere to charge all Men of Underſtanding with the immediate and obvious Conſequences of what they hold; many being better than their Principles: Yet it may be as needful for Civil Governments to judg accordingly, as to preſerve themſelves. But as poor Diſſenters are ſuppoſed to be ſhut out of God's Church, and depriv'd of all the ordinary means of Salvation, becauſe of their Miſtakes; 'tis requiſite thus to turn the Queſtion upon them who caſt the firſt Stone.

And ſome will be ready to ſuggeſt, that Obſtinacy, Vanity to be at the Head of a Party, an Expectation of being conſiderable enough to be bought off, too great Pride to acknowledg an Error, or the like, are more truely Ingredients in the Clerical Schiſm, than Malice or Hypocriſy in that which the Laity are aſpers'd with.

But to return to our Doctor. He had own'd that *Chriſt's Myſtical Body is an Aggregation or Collection of all throughout the Face of the Earth who embrace the Faith he hath delivered.* From St. *Auſtin* he tells us, *Schiſmaticks are not to be look'd upon as Chriſtians.*

And yet they who agree in the ſame Faith, and ſeparate, or are driven or kept out only upon the account of Ceremonies, nor are charg'd with want of Charity, are *Schiſmaticks* with him: and that though many of them were bred up under other Paſtors, and

and cannot be ſaid to have rent themſelves from the Church of *England.*

This indeed muſt be ſaid for him, that though St. *Auſtin,* and other antient Fathers, make no Degrees of Schiſm, and knew of none, but in ſuch as divide out of Malice or Hypocriſy, or at leaſt from ſuch terms as Chriſt required: Our Doctor makes Degrees of *Schiſm* without Authority from the Apoſtles, or the Fathers. He tells us, ſome are greater *Schiſmaticks* than others; yet the leaſt are guilty of the Sin of *Schiſm.* And ſo perhaps we may find a *Schiſm* which is not a Rent from God's Church, nor a Breach of Charity among Chriſtians: And then I would gladly know how the Nature of *Schiſm* remains?

And indeed it is evident that as he applies the Name of *Schiſmaticks* to them *who embrace the Faith Chriſt has deliver'd*; and whom he cannot in general charge with dividing from other Chriſtians out of Hypocriſy or Malice: he imputes Schiſm to them who certainly remain true Members of God's Church, and maintain that Bond which unites them to their Fellow-Chriſtians.

Yet notwithſtanding all the ſeeming Softnings, 'tis plain the Doctor will not allow ſuch to be true Members of God's Church: For, he ſays, to be a *Member of the Catholick, 'tis neceſſary to be of ſome particular Church.* Nor can it be deny'd that he charges the Proteſtant Diſſenters with failure of what is neceſſary to being of the Catholick Church. And though in the Choice of Churches he reſtrains it to ſuch as God may be acceptably ſerved in: Yet I ſhall ſoon ſhew he makes it abſolutely neceſſary to be of ſome viſible Church, and therein agrees with the Pa-

Papiſts; and differs only, in that he will have the Church of *England* ſo called, that is, they who are united under the ſame Eccleſiaſtical Polity, to be the Church. Yet ſome would think that as *Chriſt's myſtical Body*, or Church Univerſal, is *a Collection of all throughout the Face of the Earth, who embrace the Faith Chriſt has delivered*: Wherein, according to this Doctor himſelf, Viſibility is by no means eſſential to the being of the Church-Univerſal, (for embracing the Faith is a pure Act of the Mind) ſo the Church of *England*, as it is a part of the whole, is a Collection of them who embrace that Faith in *England*. Every part muſt be in ſome place: but it would not ceaſe to be a part if there were no other part upon the place to join with. And therefore a ſingle Perſon may make as true a part of Chriſt's Body, as the greateſt Numbers.

But examine the ground for the Imputation of
Page 18. *Schiſm* upon our Proteſtant Diſſenters, becauſe they
Page 16. *cauſleſsly divide or rend themſelves from that Church of which* de jure *they are Members*. This he had explained before, where he ſays, *that I call every Mans particular Church, not which it may be he himſelf doth call ſo, but which the lawful Authority of the Country where he liveth hath made ſo.*

Now I would gladly know by what Law Diſſenters are ſtill obliged to conform to the Ceremonies of our Church, and in that reſpect to become Members? Is it becauſe the Law leaves others the Poſſeſſion of the material Churches made with Hands?
Page 18. This indeed I think he offers at, when he tells us *how they under whoſe ſpiritual Conduct ſuch Perſons put themſelves, can ſatisfy their own Minds, he knows not*

But

But I ſhould think they might ſay, Are Ye Miniſters of the Goſpel? So are We. Are Ye to take care of the Flock over which Chriſt hath made you Overſeers? So are We. Nay, what if they ſhould ſay, Your Biſhops look over the Clergy and not the Flock: Your inferior Clergy are not Paſtors, but Curates to the Biſhops: Wherefore we are ready to enter upon the Trial, which of us are moſt properly Paſtors of Chriſt's Inſtitution.

Vid. The Prayer in the Lyturgy for Biſhops and Curates; *and at the Conſecration of Biſhops:* Biſhops the Paſtors of the Church.
Vid. The ſame Proteſtant Principles.

Or what if they ſhould ſay farther, Your Biſhops Lord it over the Flock, and contrary to the Apoſtolick Example, and the antient uſage in *England*, claim a Power of making *Laws, Canons, and Conſtitutions in the Church* without the Laity; with this only difference among them, that ſome place the Power in every ſingle Biſhop, and ſo far are *Independants*; others in the *Epiſcopal Colledg*, or Aſſembly of all the Biſhops in a Kingdom: The laſt of which I think is moſt agreeable to their Notion who are only for a National Church: the others ſeem not aware, that, according to them, every diſtinct Dioceſs makes a Church. And if it ſhould fall out that the primitive Dioceſſes were but ſingle Aſſemblies of them who worſhip'd God in the ſame place with *one Heart and one Mind*, though with different Poſtures, then every Proteſtant Congregation may chance to put in for as compleat a Church as any: and others may be as great *Schiſmaticks* in refuſing to Communicate with them, as they for not Communicating with others.

Vid. Spelm Council de modo tenendi Synodos apud Anglos.

Vid. Proteſtant Principles Licens'd.

Vid. Proteſtant Principles

Vid. Clackſon's Primitive Epiſcopacy.

The

The Doctor indeed, ſpeaking of the Diſſenting Miniſters receiving thoſe whom he takes *de jure* to be Members of the *Church of England*, ſays, *How oppoſite ſoever they may be to the Pope in other matters, in this his Uſurpation they agree with him, and can no more be juſtify'd in it than he.*

Pag. 18. *They under whoſe ſpiritual Conduct ſuch Perſons put themſelves.*

Na he no where takes the Miniſters for Brethren.

And thus in the Spirit of Meekneſs and with many gentle ſtroakings to the Laity, the Preachers are call'd Uſurpers, the hearers Schiſmaticks.

For my part, waving the Queſtion about a compleat Paſtor, and the due Government of the Church, I ſhould rather fear that the Charge of Schiſm might be retorted upon them, whoever they are, who ſo far uſurp upon Chriſt's Office, as to make more or other Terms of Communion than Chriſt hath made. And whoſoever inſiſt upon Conformity to other Terms, I ſhould think to be real *Schiſmaticks*, how-much ſoever others ſuffer under the Name.

Sure I am Schiſm lies in ſomething elſe beſides cauſleſs Separation from external Communion: for otherwiſe the Apoſtle would never have charg'd it upon them who continued in the ſame external Communion; as did the *Corinthians*, to whom alone he appli'd the word. If the Apoſtle applied this to them who continued the ſame external Communion, and never to them who divided or ſeparated from ſuch Communion; 'tis evident *Schiſm* does not lie in Separation from external Communion, though there may be *Schiſm* in the Separation. I take it not to lie ſo much in divided Communions, as the uncharitableneſs of them on either ſide.

Vid. 1 Cor. 12. 25. *that there ſhould be no* Schiſm *in the Body, but that the Members ſhould have the ſame care one for another.*

As Schiſm is a Rent, we ſhall never know what ſort of Rent is Schiſm, till we ſettle the bond of Union,

on, which I ſhould think to be Charity: For they who are united in the ſame Faith and external Communion, may be guilty of Schiſm, both in Relation to others, and among themſelves; which they who maintain that perfect bond of Charity cannot be, in either Reſpect.

But evident it is that the Papiſts, and others from them, have taken up a Notion of *Schiſm* which the Apoſtle never mentioned. And, according to this Doctor himſelf, was never intended by St. *Auſtin*, or other antient Fathers. And if the Livings will not ſatisfy our *Pluraliſts*, unleſs the Non-conformiſts be expoſed, as the Chriſtians of old, in the skins of wild Beaſts, to be hunted down, they will find their Congregations thinner than yet they are: for it is not to be thought that the Laity in general will Countenance this Uncharitableneſs, and Communicate with them in this real *Schiſm*. But let them not any longer hang up that *Theological Scarecrow Schiſm*, till their Church, or rather aggregation of Churches, is wide enough to comprehend all Chriſtians. But till it is ſo, why may it not be enough for us here, to do as he ſhews to be our Duty in Relation to other Chriſtian Churches abroad, *mutually to own and Acknowledg every one the other, as far as they own and acknowledg Chriſt.* *Vid. Gal.* 1. 2. *unto the* Churches *of* Galatia. *Page* 26.

'Indeed he ſays, *Inaſmuch as to be a Member of the* 'Catholick Church it is neceſſary to be of ſome particular 'Church: if he may acceptably ſerve God, and finally ſave 'his Soul in it, every Perſon ought for Peace and 'Order ſake to live in Communion of that Church, 'where the Providence of God hath plac'd him, and 'not for every Diſlike, Defect, or Blemiſh, to depart 'from it. *Ibid.*

Here he manifeſtly ſpeaks of a viſible Church, to which Men muſt outwardly conform for Peace and Order. This he owns that Men are not oblig'd to conform to, unleſs they may *acceptably ſerve God* in it. Yet without obſerving that, it is poſſible for the Church, where the Providence of God has plac'd a Man, to be ſuch an one, as God cannot be acceptably ſerved in it. (Though indeed this is implyed in the *if it may*, for as it may be, it may not be) He makes the being a Member of a Particular Church neceſſary to being of the Catholick, and by Conſequence, to Salvation. And yet it is a very great Queſtion how a Man can *ſerve God acceptably* in any Church, which he believes has ſuch *Defects* or *Blemiſhes*, as juſtify his Separation for the ſake of a Communion with fewer *Defects*, or *Blemiſhes*. And I know not what can hinder ſuch a Communion from making a viſible Church wherein he may *ſerve God acceptably*. Or why the external Peace and Order in a Church, for all to move together like a piece of Clock-work, ſhould be perferr'd before his ſpiritual Advantages. And now the Law allows a Liberty, ſome will think that they who leave the Parochial Worſhip for the ſake of another Religious Meeting, are no more *Schiſmaticks*, than they who refuſe to Communicate in the Cathedrals, for the ſake of Parochial Worſhip with fewer Ceremonies.

But ſuppoſe all Churches or Communions viſible, ſhould impoſe Terms which a Man conſcientiouſly ſcruples: What hinders but the ſame *Lord*, the ſame *Faith*, the ſame *Baptiſm*, with a readineſs, as far as he has *attained*, to walk by the ſame Rule with all Chriſtians, may rather make him a Member of Chriſt's Family both here and in Heaven, than that his ſcruples in other matters, wherein he has not attained

tained to the Sentiments of Men of larger Capacities and Opportunities, ſhould ſhut himout, and leave him *extra Eccleſiam forâs.*

Thus I have ſet thoſe Notions in their proper Light, which are ſuch *means* to *remedy* our *Differences*, as *Procruſtes* his bed for the different lengths of Mens bodies. *Vid. pag.* 14.

And methinks this *Procruſtian* humour is prety evident, where he vindicates the vein of Creed-making, while he condemns the Church of *Rome* for her uncharitableneſs in damning all that come not punctually up to her Tenents: which though himſelf does not directly, it will appear that he, by a Conſequence of his own, damns all them, who do not in matters of belief comply with the Church where they live, when that Church is ſuch an one as he ſuppoſes, a Man may *ſerve God acceptably, and finally ſave his Soul in it.*

'So far, ſays he, was the ancient Church from it, *Page* 9.
'that all the *Credenda* ſhe requir'd of them ſhe *admitted*
'*to her Communion*, for ſome ages, was *only an Ac-*
'*knowledgment of the Articles of the Creed we call the A-*
'*poſtles*, and preſt no more on them; and though *all*
'*Churches ſince have added others* ſome more ſome leſs;
'it appeareth by their not judging one another a-
'bout receiving or not receiving them, this is not ſo
'much from any Opinion they have of the *abſolute*
'*Neceſſity of holding thoſe Articles*, as of *the abſolute Ne-*
'*ceſſity of preſerving Peace among their own Members*,
'who were like to make Diſturbances about them.

Wherein there is couch't this excellent Paradox, that *it is abſolutely neceſſary for the Peace of ſome particular Churches, that, before Men be admitted into Communion, they ſhould receive ſome Articles of belief, which are not of Univerſal Obligation, and by conſequence are more*

than Chriſt or his Apoſtles required.

So that it ſeems Men are to be deprived of Church-Communion, for matters of Belief enjoyn'd by meer humane Authority, and ſome who talk high for Catholick-Communion, themſelves ſhut the doors againſt it.

It is needful to be a Chriſtian, but it would certainly be much better for Mankind, than it is, if they would be ſo wiſe to take neither ſide, while Church-men play their Prizes.

Few that are not wedded to a Party, and think it needful to make Peace by the Deſtruction of all but their own Faction, can believe that new Impoſitions, eſpecially in matters of Belief, are any other than the occaſions of Differences, and the Shiboleths which divide the Chriſtian World: Nor can they comprehend why any thing ſhould be needful to be believed in one Church, which is not in every Church.

It may often be requiſite, for Peace ſake, to Provide that no Man hold publickly any thing contrary to a received form of Words; but whoever impoſe them as terms of Communion, ought to produce a Warrant from Divine Authority.

To be of the Catholick Church is neceſſary to Salvation, and if, as Men of the Doctors Sentiments contend, no Man can be of the Catholick, who is not of the particular Church where he lives, if that be a true Church, or ſuch an one in which he may ſerve God acceptably, and finally ſave his Soul; Then ſuch a Church, requiring other Articles of Belief, or in other words than Chriſt or his Apoſtles required, makes thoſe Articles neceſſary to Salvation: and if they who are ſhut out of one true Church, ought not to be admitted into any other, without

Letters

Letters Commendatory from the Church, of which he had been, or *de jure* was a Member; then at leaſt there may be a total Excluſion from the Catholick Church for ſuch terms as Chriſt or his Apoſtles never required: and thus Men may become Schiſmaticks for *Doctrinals* as well as Ceremonies, which they honeſtly ſcruple. They who hold this, would do well to preach up St. *Zavierus* his new Goſpel, invented with the like pious Intention: But when they talk of theſe things for the Peace of the Church, I cannot but apply the old obſervation, *ſolitudinem faciunt, & pacem vocant*: but for certain, how merciful ſoever *God Almighty* may be hereafter; you muſt believe as the Church where you live believes, if you would have Peace here.

Vid. Dr. Stillingfleets *Fanaticiſm of the Church of* Rome.

But if there ought to be a Catholick Communion on Earth, and they who are deprived of one Churches Communion, ought to be of all; this ſhews how neceſſary it is that Communion ſhould be upon terms truly Catholick.

The contrary to the other Notion ſhines methinks with native Light, in an excellent Diſcourſe of my learned Friend, Dr. *Bringhurſt*, who adorned his Doctrine, by a ſteady Adherence to it in the worſt of times.

'We, ſays he, make this Yoke and Burden un-
'eaſier than Chriſt has made it to one another,
'when we impoſe, as neceſſary Articles of our Faith,
'either what it is certain our Saviour and his Apo-
'ſtles never impoſed, or uncertain whether they did
'or no.

Vid. Dr. Bringhurſts *Sermon before the Lord Mayor, May 26, 1689. Pag.* 24.

'Articles of Faith neceſſary to Salvation can de-
'rive Authority from none but God; he only can tell
'us what will be acceptable to himſelf, ſo that the
'Scriptures only of the Old and New Teſtament (by
'all

'all Protestants,) being the Revelation that God hath 'given of his Will in this case to us; Whatever is 'made necessary that is not here, must be a very un-'easy Yoke and heavy Burden: for 'tis not in a 'Mans Power to believe as Men would have him; 'we cannot believe beyond our Evidence, and our 'Evidence must be as we can understand it; so that 'what is necessary must be supposed to be intelligibly 'revealed to all concerned in the Belief of it.

Vid. P. 8. Wherever the Scripture it self does impose a Character of necessity, either for Faith or Practice, we cannot speak plainer to one another than that doth to us: And if any thing be revealed which we cannot comprehend, as for Instance, the Article of the Trinity, yet the Revelation is plain; and in all matters of Revelation we are to believe no more than is revealed, and no otherwise of it, than as it is revealed, &c.

'This hath often made me think that we should 'be easier to one another, were the Articles of our 'Faith given us in the very words of the Scripture. 'I am sure that both the *Orthodox* and the *Arians* 'in the Council of *Nice* concurred in this; that *all* '*the Mischiefs in the Church of God were caused by* '*bringing in words into the Creeds of the Church,* '*which were not in the Scriptures.* Consequences in-'deed are as sure as the express terms of the Scrip-'tures, but Infallibility in these Consequences, seems 'to be necessary for Articles of Faith, because infal-'lible Authority only can create them. *Certainty* '*may satisfy a Man's Conscience for his own sense and* '*Compliance, but for terms of Communion that may not* '*be sufficient,* because that is so according to Mens 'different Capacities and Apprehensions, *&c. We* '*are to believe no more than the Word of God declares* '*to us, and also as it declares it*; and if we desire 'more of one another, we make Christ's Yoke more 'uneasy, and his Burden heavier than he hath made 'it.

As

As all Men are preſumed to have ſome end in what they do, unleſs where they act in paſſion without Conſideration: It were worth enquiring to what end this Sermon (which, for the ſake of my Country, I cannot but diſrobe) was preach'd at this time? Was it to convince the Diſſenters? Then ſince he could not expect that ſuch ſhould be his Hearers, it muſt have been preach'd to be printed. Which may take off Mens Surprize at ſuch a Command, more likely to be obtained, than given *ex mero motu*: Unleſs it ſhould proceed from Diſlike, and be intended, as it has proved, a gentle enjoyning of publick Penance: which all muſt agree to be ſuitable to his Majeſties great Judgment and Clemency. However there was ſmall reaſon to believe, that they were thus to be brought over now, who perſiſted in their Diſſent, when they could not ſerve God in publick without being made Rioters: And to be a Diſſenter, was counted not only a *Dividing from God's Church*, but the being of a Faction againſt the *State*. And in all reſpects both themſelves, and all who wiſh'd well to them, ſuffered accordingly.

Was it to induce his Majeſty to withdraw his Protection and Favour from ſuch; as being ſhut out from God's care, and not worthy of his Majeſties? But ſurely 'tis not to be ſuppoſed that his Majeſty, who had reaſon to believe that he *ſerv'd God acceptably in* Holland, where there was no *National Church*, ſhould be perſwaded of the Neceſſity of being a Member of ſuch a particular Church, that one may be a *Member of the Catholick*. Was it to raiſe a Contempt of the Proteſtant Diſſenters in the Generality of the Hearers; and thence to animate a party for the Church? This may with better ground be look'd on as the encouraging a Faction againſt the

State,

State, at a time when the Union of Proteſtants is little leſs than eſſential to its being.

Whoever goes to make the King, a King of one party of Proteſtants, under a pretence of advancing the Intereſt of the Church of *England*, would certainly have a Reward according to his Merit, if the late King ſhould by the Advantages ſuch put into his Hands, come again to be its *Defender*.

Such muſt underſtand, that though the greater part of the Nation have fewer Scruples than the Diſſenters have; yet, as they are united with them in the ſame Profeſſion of Faith, and Affection to the preſent Government; they cannot but deſire to live with them as Men who muſt ſtand or fall by the ſame common Intereſt.

And if they who are otherwiſe minded are not guilty of making a *Schiſm* in the State, I am ſure they who refuſe to ſwear Allegiance to King *William* and Queen *Mary*, are. And this more truly anſwers the *Apoſtles* Notion of *Schiſm*, than that which Clergy-men have taken up to keep together a Party, which, if they give the Word, may be, and often have been, troubleſome to Civil Governments. Unreaſonable Quarrels, and Strifes, proceeding from Pride, and carnal Conſiderations, are the moſt truly *Schiſmatical*. And why the Diſſenters may not be even with many of them in returning the Cenſure, I ſee no reaſon. Sure I am, they have had more tender Uſage than the *Diſſenters* had. Their Conſciences were to be admitted to labour with Qualms for many Months: In which time a great Judgment might be made, which ſide would be uppermoſt. Whereas the poor Diſſenters muſt in an inſtant be reſolved of all their Scruples, or yield to a ſpeedy Deprivation, without any intermediate Suſpenſion, to

bring

bring them to consider, by feeling a temporary loss.

Some may think this an uncharitable Insinuation, that the Clergy by their Friends prest for so long time, till they might see which side would prevail. But besides that the Points in question might otherwise soon be determined one way or other: this can be no great doubt to them, who have heard how many were seized with suddain Scruples, upon the flying report of General *Maccay*'s being routed; or who consider upon what Ground many of them have prayed for King *William*, which is barely as he is King *de facto*, as appears by their now declining to swear Allegiance to him. And of them who swear Allegiance, some at least go upon the same Ground. Or if more, as his *Title is allowed of by the Law, and conferr'd with those Formalities of Law, and with those usual Ceremonies and Rites, which customarily are observ'd in the most regular Collation of Titles.* Wherein that *Clergy-Man* who offers *Considerations for taking the Oath of Allegiance*, leaves a Surmise that our *King*'s Title may not have been *according to the strict Rules of Justice*, as being *obtained by due means, or conferred without Injustice or Injury done to any Person*; which he distinguishes from a Title barely *allowed of by the Law*. Nay, he manifestly supposes that the late King is injured; he being *God's Ordinance, the Minister of God for good*, not to be resisted, and we bound to be subject to him, however he *demeaned himself in the Exercise of the Government*. And this he applies equally to *wicked Magistrates*, who act without regard to those Bounds which the Law has set them, And *even Usurpers*; that is, to Usurpers both of Power and of Title, as long as they are in Possession. But herein only is he unequal, that whereas he tells us that *though Princes exert Power with-*

Considerations for taking the Oath of Allegiance. Page 53.

Page 46, & 47.

Page 50.

Page 56. *without due Title or Commiſſion from God:* that is, are Uſurpers of *Power, we are bound to ſuffer patiently, and be ſubject for Conſcience towards God,* and cannot *forceably reſiſt them without Peril of Damnation:* Yet when he ſpeaks of a King *de facto,* coming in with uſual Formalities of Law, ſuppos'd by him to be an Uſurper of Title, he ſays *that which we tranſlate Damnation, is* κρίμα, *that is, Judgment:* Page 57. *And Treaſon againſt a King* de facto *is puniſhable by the Judgment of Death.* This is *Treaſon by our Law*; and *I do thus offend by levying War againſt the King for the time being, though in favour of a King* de jure. *It may be Judgment to reſiſt the King* de facto, *in favour of a King* de jure, i. e. *it may be an offence which by the Law may render me obnoxious to Judgment.* And by Conſequence, a Man may rebel againſt the King *de facto,* whenever he has Opportunity or fair Proſpect of Impunity here, and may *be ſubject for Wrath, but not for Conſcience ſake.* In ſhort, if you reſiſt him, you ſhall be hang'd; if you reſiſt the other, you ſhall be damn'd.

Suppoſe then that the late King, encourag'd by them who believe him ſtill to continue King *de jure,* ſhould land here with *French* and *Iriſh* Forces, having their Commiſſions ſeal'd within the Kingdom: according to this Doctrine, neither he, nor the Forces commiſſioned by him, are to be reſiſted: Nor is our King to expect Aſſiſtance from ſuch Men in other Exigencies. Taxes indeed 'tis confeſt are to be paid as a Salary for his protecting them, *for this very cauſe that he attends continually upon the Government.* Yet it may be a Queſtion whether they would not think that the others preſence might diſcharge or transfer the Taxes. But *as for our Endeavours to keep*

Page 34. *Not the Power in being while incapable by being out of Poſſeſſion to exerciſe any Act belonging to the Supream Powr, So. Pa. 37.*

Page 56.

King

King William *in his Station* by our Arms, according to this Divine, *It can only be ſo far our Duty, as it is lawful ſo to do*; which is as much as to ſay, it is no Duty at all, but is left indifferent, whether you will exerciſe your lawful Power or no. *Page* 56.

Nor, ſays he, *Do I find St.* Paul *inculcating it as any part of our Subjection to the higher Powers.*

This goes upon the Notion of a certain Leading Man, who makes *Non-Reſiſtance to be abſolute Subjection, and as much as can or ought to be required by the Soveraign Power*: as if active Obedience to lawful Commands were not in the leaſt imply'd in being ſubject. But I take ὑποτάσσεσθαι, the Word which the *Apoſtle* uſes, chiefly to import Action in a regular Diſcharge of the Duties of an Inferiour to his Superiour; and when St. *Peter* uſes the ſame Word in Relation to every *humane Ordinance* or *Creature*, ὑποτάγητε πάσῃ ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτίσει, I would gladly know whether 'tis meant of the Fountain and Derivation of Power, or elſe of the Commands iſſuing from the Power? If the firſt, then the right of the *late King* was not, as ſome contend, ſuch as *no Religion, no Law, no Fault or Forfeiture can alter or diminiſh*: If the laſt, then active Obedience to lawful Commands is required by the very Letter: but I cannot ſee how the ſame Text ſhould require paſſive Obedience to unlawful Commands, any more than it does active; and whoever does not actively obey the lawful ones, does as much reſiſt the Power, nay more than he who reſiſts a Perſon aſſuming a Power which never was given him by God or Man. He ſays farther, *Nor doth our Law ſince the Ceſſation of the Tenure of Knights Service, require it perſonally of all Subjects; at leaſt, we of the Clergy cannot be concern'd in it; becauſe we by ſo many Statutes are exempted from bearing Arms.* *Vid. Hiſtory of Paſſive Obedience.* *Page* 106. *Page* 59.

Herein he ſhews that he talks out of his Profeſſion; for as to Perſonal Service, whatever might be requiſite in *Grand Serjeanty*, by which a Man is to be the *King's Champion*, or the like in his own Perſon; 'tis evident *Knights Service* was not perſonal; for otherwiſe it had been impoſſible for a Man who held ſeveral Knights Fees, to have diſcharged the Duty of his tenure.

Even where there was no Knight's Service antiently, and ſince its being taken away, all Men have been, and yet are oblig'd to provide Arms, and the Bodies of Men, either their own or others, for the Defence of the Kingdom, according to their Eſtates real or perſonal. Nor have the Clergy any Exemption for this: Neither do the Acts eſtabliſhing a Militia, diſcharge any Man from this, which is a Duty at Common Law; of which the *Confeſſors* Law, and the Statute of *Winchester* are declaratory.

But what ever Exemption Clergy-men have, it is becauſe of their Attendance in their Miniſterial Office; upon which account the diſſenting Miniſters have the like Exemption by the late Statute. What then if any of our Clergy decline ſwearing Allegiance till the time of Deprivation incurs? may and will they ſtill exercise their Function? If they may and will, why might not they as well who were turn'd out by the *Bartholomew* Act? If they may not or will not, what Exemption can they claim more than Lay-men? If they ſay ſtill their Character is indelible, Is no Duty annexed to the Character?

But is not this fine Doctrine to be inſinuated now; as if no Man were obliged to endeavour by Arms to keep our *King* in his *Station*? Or if other Men are, at leaſt not Clergy-men: But that if you reſiſt him by Arms, nothing but want of Succeſs can make it criminal?

Sure

Sure I am that egregious Pattern of Chriſtian fortitude Mr. *Johnſon*, on whom this Author reflects, was degraded by his Brethren, and delivered over to the ſecular ſcourge, for leſs than this.

When I conſider how earneſtly this Man preſſes taking the Oaths, I cannot but think of the Advice ſaid to be given by the late King to his Friends here, That as many of them as can ſhould get into Offices. And we may hence obſerve what is to be expected from thoſe *Clergy-Men*, who take the Oath of Allegiance with a Proteſtation, that they do it barely as to a King *de facto*: their Loyalty may vie with St. *Beckets*, who was for ſwearing to the King with a *ſalvo jure* to the Pope: whether ſuch ought to be ſuffer'd to ſpread their Doctrines with a Face of Authority, and what Puniſhments they deſerve, who accept of ſuch Proteſtations, I ſubmit to my Superiors. But ſure I am this will not be enough in Law to keep their Livings, unleſs they are favour'd by an undue entry upon Record.

Yet who can chuſe but wonder how from the ſame Text, a Clergy Man ſhould enforce the Obligation of ſubmitting to a Tyrant in the exerciſe of Power, upon pain of Damnation, and yet make the Penalty leſs in the caſe of reſiſting one, who is really *God's ordinance, as* he is a *Miniſter of Good*, but in his opinion wants Title, though the Law be on his ſide. This can be for no other Reaſon, but that whatſoever becomes of the State, Church-Men muſt not recede from their darling Notion of *Non-reſiſtance*. And rather than they ſhould be thought *Eccleſiaſtical Weather-cocks*, the State muſt be turn'd round again into Confuſion. Nor do they care how much they reflect upon thoſe noble Patriots, who invited this King when he was Prince, and appeared in Arms with

Vid. pag. 41 without condemning the Doctrine of Non-reſiſtance.

Ibid.

with him for the Proteſtant Cauſe; If they can but free their *Coat* from the neceſſity of retracting thoſe *Slaviſh Doctrines*, which though many of them have renounced in their Actions they would ſtill juſtify in Principle. And as it is to be preſum'd that every Man will act according to his Principle when he has an inviting Opportunity; I leave it to all impartial Men to conſider, which are moſt likely to be true to the preſent Government, they who believe the Soveraign Power *inſeparable from the Perſon of the late King*, that they were in a State of Damnation who offered to reſiſt his Arbitrary Uſurpations, that themſelves are exempted from aſſiſting this Government with their Perſons or their Arms in the utmoſt Extremity, and may reſiſt when they are likely to eſcape temporal Judgment: Or they who are ready to hold to the Death, that our preſent King has as good a Title as ever King of *England* had; Which has already been evinced in ſome Meaſure; And did the Men of Scruples vouchſafe to produce any colourable Objection, ſhould be farther.

Vid. Jovan, In all ſoveraign Governments the Subjects are and ought to be ſlaves if if the King pleaſes.

Indeed a certain injudicious *Author* has, with a plain evil Deſign againſt the preſent Settlement, heapt up Numbers of Quotations to prove, that it is *a Truth as eternal and unalterable* as any *Doctrine of Chriſtianity*, that a Superior is not *in Things unlawful* to be reſiſted, *upon any pretence whatſoever*: in the utmoſt extent of which Aſſertion, no ſort of *Superior*, Juſtice of the Peace or other is to be reſiſted, even where he acts without colour of his Office.

Hiſtory of Paſſive Obedience conſidered. Vid. Preface.

Ibid:

But what he drives at is, that Men ought to be *unalterably true to their Oaths*, and ſuppos'd Duty to the late King: at leaſt he will allow of no diſcharge in Law ſufficient, unleſs the late King give an expreſs releaſe; and according to his Quotation out of

Hiſt. pag. 54.

Dr.

Dr. *Hammond's practical Catechiſm,* will have the Duty of Allegiance to continue *where the ſuppos'd legal Soveraign doth ſtill claim his Right to his Kingdoms, and to the Allegiance of his Subjects, no way acquitting them from their Oaths, or laying down his Pretentions, though for the preſent he be overpower'd.* *Hiſtory, pag.* 54.

This I am ſure he will never prove to be *the ſteady Doctrine* of that *Church,* which he calls *poor and deſpiſed,* and of *whoſe Intereſts he pretends to the deepeſt ſenſe,* while he would render it, ſuch, by keeping it too firmly attach'd to the Intereſt of the late miſguided and unfortunate King: let him if he can ſqueez this ſenſe out of its *Articles* or *Homilies.* Certain it is, he is far from bringing a *cloud of Witneſſes* to his imaginary *eternal verity.* *Preface.*

Few of the paſſages which he cites enforce more than Obedience to lawful Authority: ſome indeed, and chiefly Perſons now alive, let fall expreſſions through inadvertency, or prevalence of ſtrong Temptations, which 'tis to be hoped that many of them have repented of; ſince their later Diſcourſes and Practices notoriouſly contradict them: and ſurely little proof of the *ſteady Doctrine* of a Church can be had from ſuch Inconſtancy. I muſt own that this Collection is to one purpoſe very uſeful; for ſome of them wanted to be thus Admoniſh'd of their frailty: and 'twill be happy for them, if this Humiliation can expiate for that poiſon, which has infected many beyond Remedy, from the Antidote they now yield; while *out of the Eater comes forth Meat,* and themſelves pull down that Edifice, which they had been building with great Pains.

But what Rivers can waſh away the ſtain of ſo much noble Blood, as has been offer'd up to this *Moloch,* a meer *Figure,* which ſome have *made to wor-*

ſhip?

ſhip? Had it not been for this *Idol*, worſe than ever the *Clowns* choſe, the Earl of *Eſſex*, Lord *Ruſſel*, and *Colonel Sydny* had been now alive in their large Capacities for heroic Actions and wholſom Counſels, as well as in their immortal Memories; and had been as conſpicuous now for the reward of their Merit, as they have been for their Sufferings. Under the Protection of this *Figure*, came out that ſhadow of a *Vindication of the late Magiſtracy and Government of* England, in Two parts, which are more *weak and Criminal attempts* upon the never-dying Fame of the Ld. *Ruſſel*, than any that he has been prov'd guilty of, otherwiſe than by a Verdict. The falſe colours in the firſt of theſe have been ſufficiently expos'd by Mr. *Hawles*, and the ſecond Anticipated. Both of them, out of pretended Zeal for the preſent *Government*, juſtify the laſt, and therein condemn this, as wanting juſt Occaſion or Foundation: and while the Author labours to waſh the Blackamore white, he beſpatters the Innocent: and yet after his Thundring pretences to mighty feats, all reſolves it ſelf into a clearing the then *Recorder*, who pronounc'd Judgment upon the Indictment which was found: but the overruling and impoſing *Judges*, the complying *Jury* (who in their paſſive Obedience to the Bench ſhew'd how much they had profited by that Doctrine) the ſcandalous *Evidence*, and ſtabbing *Rhetorick* of the eager *Counſel*, are left to ſhift for themſelves.

The cenſure of the two Vindications of the Magiſtracy and Government of England, *written againſt the defence of* Lord Ruſſels *Innocence.*

Our *Collector* I find as impotent in his Heat as the *Vindicator*: after all the formidable things which he has produc'd to ſhew the *remedileſs Caſe of Mankind by the Encroachments of Princes*; he confeſſes that where a *Government was founded in compact, and all priviledges Sacred and Civil contrary to that agreement*

Page 118.

Page 27.

were

were invaded; this alters the Caſe, while it can no way hold good in Governments where there is no ſuch Compact.

And herein we are agreed.

Hi motus animorum, atque hæc certamina tanta,
Pulveris exigui jactu compoſta quieſcunt.

Thus notwithſtanding all the flouriſh of Quotations from *Divines*, he ſends us to the *Common-Lawyers*. And one would think he was aſleep when he made uſe of this paſſage from the witty Dr. *Donne*, Though ſome ancient Greek States which are call'd *Regna Laconica*, becauſe they are ſhortned and *limited to certain Laws*; *and ſome States in our time, ſeem to have conditional and proviſional Princes, between whom and Subjects there are mutual and reciprocal Obligations, which if one ſide break, they fall on the other*: Yet that Soveraignty, which is a power to do all things available to the main Ends, reſides ſomewhere, which if it be in the hands of one Man, erects and perfects that *Pambaſilia* of which we ſpeak. Page 40.

If therefore thoſe Expreſſions which run higheſt in maintenance of the unalterable Right of Princes, can reaſonably be intended only of ſuch as have the *Power to do all things available to the main ends* of Government, without Limitation to *certain Laws*; then they who have not this unlimited Power by the Conſtitution, may be *conditional and proviſional Princes.*

Should now our *Hiſtorian* ſtrike out all his dead Authors, who have expreſſions of a quite contrary

import to what he cites from themſelves or others, and all thoſe living ones who have contradicted themſelves in Words, or a ſeries of Actions; I aſſure my ſelf his bulky Book would ſhrink into a very narrow Compaſs: and yet as it is, himſelf has condemn'd it to lie for waſt paper, till he proves our Government was not *founded in Compact*, and that there are no Limitations by Laws to make it ſuch an one as Dr. *Donne* calls *Laconic*. When he produces his Evidence of a *Pambaſilia* here, I ſhould think it no difficult task to convince all but himſelf of his Error.

I take Judg *Broughton* to be the beſt Reſolver of all Scruples in this kind that ever I met with of a *Divine*, even better than that *Great Man*, who as he has been ſhewn moſt of his Miſtakes upon the *Grand Queſtion*, by that extraordinary Perſon, lately deceaſed, Dr. *Twiſden*, little inferiour to his Brother Sir *Roger*, ſo I ſuppoſe he is by this time ſatisfied that the *Fundamental Contract* is not ſo *inviſible*, but it may be found and underſtood.

The *Collector* refers to a Book, which I muſt own never to have been maſter of, written by a Perſon now of great Eminence and Station, with theſe Words;

P. 73. *If you charge the Doctrine of abſolute Submiſſion as brutiſh or ſtupid, or contrary to the Law of Nature, ſee you do not run into Blaſphemy, by charging the Holy one fooliſhly.*

Some would think the *Obedience without Reſerve* required of the Scotch Nation, to be but a due Improvement of this. But I may refer him to the Laws

Laws of our Land, common Senſe, or the ſame Perſons better thoughts, for a more generous Idea of this matter.

And if our learned *Rabbies* go about to ſhew, that the frightful Repreſentation which *Samuel* made of the way or manner of future Kings of *Iſrael*, was but the *Jus Regium*, *the Fundamental Law of the Kings of* Iſrael; and that the Kings of *England* have *a Supremacy in their Dominion in all Cauſes Eccleſiaſtical and Secular, according to the Powers inveſted in the Jewiſh Kings under the Law.* Page 69. Page 78.

Wherein, indeed, I tack together the Propoſition of one, in Explanation of the other; yet if the laſt meant it in the ſame ſenſe, in which the other explains the Power of the Kings of *Iſrael*; I may well call for the Pedigree, to prove how our Kings derive their Title to this, or that Law which makes the Jewiſh Polity Univerſal: and for a clearer Argument *ad hominem*, I muſt ſay, that very *Author's* own Practice is a ſufficient Confutation.

But if they who are by the great and magnanimous *Prince*, who now fills the Throne, called to a more perfect Law of Liberty in this Year of *Jubilee*, refuſe to be free; I may ſay, that like the *Hebrew Servant* bought with a price, or rather Slave, in the ſame caſe, they ſhould have their *Ears boar'd* to diſtinguiſh them from others, who delight not in Slavery.

And if while Bleſſings, like *God Almighty's*, deſcend upon the *Evil and the Good*, the Enemies and the Friends to our Peace; my *Fleece*, as that of *Gideon's*, remains unwatered with the Dew of *Heaven*; I muſt

must consider, that even that was to him a Sign of God's Presence.

And tho this should, with former Services to the Publick, be made matter of Accusation, yet ought I not to faint in the Cause of Truth, and my Country; which amidst many Imperfections and Disadvantages, I must avow to the World, from the first dawnings of my Understanding, ever to have serv'd with Sincerity, and the utmost Endeavours of,

SIR,

Yours most faithfully, &c.

FINIS.